

ملخص

ادوار المتخاطبين فى رواية «جوزيف أندروز» لفيلدينج

د. أمين الرباط *

استفادت الدراسات الأدبية كثيراً من الأعمال الحديثة التى أجريت فى مجال اللغويات، وعلى الرغم من أنه مازال هناك اتجاه سائد بين بعض نقاد الأدب فى تجاهل أو التقليل من شأن المحاولات التى يبذلها علماء اللغة المعاصرون فى تطبيق نظرياتهم واكتشافاتهم على دراسة وتفسير النصوص الأدبية، فسوف تظل حقيقة التحليل اللغوى للملامح مثل النحو والمفردات والخطاب تقدم أساساً مرضياً لمناقشة الأعمال الأدبية.

لقد كانت هناك خطوات هامة منذ الستينات فى مجال الدراسات اللغوية للنصوص الأدبية.

ولقد كان علماء الأساليب فى الستينات والسبعينات مشغولين أساساً بموضوعات مثل «تعريف الأسلوب»، «فصل الكلمات أو العبارات التى تخرج عما هو مألوف فى عالم النحو، والمعجم والأصوات - فصلها عن الشفرات التى كانت تتميز بها بعض النصوص الأدبية، خاصة الشعرية.

هذه المقالة تناقش العلاقات الاجتماعية التى توجد بين الشخصيات، كما يعبر عنها النظام اللغوى والحوار والمحادثة، مما يساعد على تحديد الدور والمكانة الاجتماعية لكل شخصية فى علاقاتها بالشخصيات الأخرى التى تتواصل معها لغوياً.

لقد تم تحليل حوار مأخوذ من رواية «جوزيف أندروز» فى ضوء النظريات اللغوية الحديثة وأدوار المشاركين وتحديد علاقات الشخصيات فيما يتعلق بـ «مبدأ التعاون»، «أسلوب المحادثة»، «نوعية وقواعد السلوك الاجتماعى الخاصة (بالياقة) و (الكرم) و (الاستحسان) و (التواضع) و (تغيير المكانة الاجتماعية) نتيجة لاستخدام ألقاب اجتماعية مختلفة فى تعاملهم مع بعضهم البعض وانعكاساتها على أدوار المتخاطبين مما يؤدى إلى ارتفاع مكانة أحدهما أو انخفاضها من خلال استخدامه وتكراره عبارات لغوية لها سمات معينة تعكس تغير هذه الأدوار الاجتماعية.

تعرض هذه المقالة إحصائية للكلمات الدالة على «السخرية»، «الإهانة»، «النقد»، «الأمر»، «التهديد»، «عدم الموافقة»، «الاحتقار»، «الالتهام» استخدام عبارات محرمة» وعدد مرات تكرارها للتعبير سلباً أو إيجاباً عن المعانى.

تؤكد المقالة على أن العلاقة الاجتماعية بين الشخصيتين المشتركين فى الحوار تتغير وتتقلب رأساً على عقب نتيجة لسوكتهما وتفاعلهما اللغوى، وهذا هو جوهر رواية جوزيف أندروز.

* أستاذ الأدب الإنجليزى المساعد بمركز اللغات والترجمة بأكاديمية الفنون القاهرة .

Leech , G. & Short , M.H. (1981) , **Style in Fiction** (London : Longman) .

Robert c. Stalnaker (1999) : “ Context and content : Essays on Intentionality
in Speech and Thought” Oxford ; New York :
Oxford University Press .

Searle , J.R. (1969) , **Speech Acts : An Essay in the Philosophy of Lan-
guage** , Cambridge , Cambridge University Press .

Searle , J.R. (1976) , ‘A Classification of Illocutionary Acts’ in **Language in
Society** 5, 1. 1-23 .

Short , M. (1989) , ‘Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Drama’ in R .
Carter & P. Simpson (eds.) **Language , Discourse and
Literature** London , Unwin Hyman , pp. 139-170 .

Simpson , P. (1989) , ‘Politeness Phenomena in Ionesco’s **The Lesson**’ . in R.
Carter & P. Simpson , (eds.) **Language , Discourse
and Literature** , London: Unwin Hyman , pp. 171-
194.

- Firbas , J. (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication* , Cambridge University Press.
- Grice , H.P. (1975) . 'Logic and Conversation', in P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.), **Syntax and Semantics** , vol. 3 **Speech Acts** (New York : Academic Press) , pp. 41-58 .
- Hasan , R. (1994) : "The conception of context in Text" in M. Gregory & P. Fries (eds) , *Discourse in society , Functional Perspectives* , Ablex Publishing , Norwood , NJ .
- Jackobson , R. (1960) , 'Linguistics and Poetics' , in T. Sebeok (ed.) , **Style in Language** MIT , pp. 350-77 .
- Katarzyna Jaszcolt (1999) : "Discourse , Beliefs , Intentions : Semantic Defaults and Propositional Attitude Ascription". Amsterdam , Philadelphia : J. Benjamins Pub . Co .
- Ken Turner (2000) : " Semantics / Pragmatics from Different Points of view" . Oxford : U. K. , New York : Elsevier .
- Leech , G. (1982) 'Pragmatics , Discourse Analysis and Literature' . in **Discourse Analysis : Theory and Application** Proceedings of the Second National Symposium on Linguistics and English Language Teaching . Cairo University , pp. 21-40 .
- Leech , G. (1983) **Principles of Pragmatics** (London : Longman) .

References

- Austin , J.L. (1962) **How to do things with words** Cambridge , Mass : Harvard University Press .
- Brown , R. & Gilman , A. (1960) 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity', in T.A. Sebeok (ed.) , **Style in Language** (Cambridge , Mass : Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press) , pp. 252-76 .
- Brown , P. & Levinson , S. (1978) , 'Universals in Language Usage . 'Politeness Phenomena', in E.N. Goody (ed.) Questions and Politeness : Strategies in Social Interaction (Cambridge University Press) , pp. 65-289 .
- Burton , D. (1982) 'Conversation Pieces' , in Carter , R. & Burton , D. (eds.) **Literary Text and Language Study** . (London : Edward Arnold) , pp. 86-115 .
- Christopher Lyons (1999) : **"Deiniteness"**, Cambridge, England: New York: Cambridge University Press .
- Coulthard , R.M. (1977) **An Introduction to Discourse Analysis** . London : Longman .
- Fowler , R. (1981) , **Literature as Social Discourse** , London : Batsford .

VI Conclusion

The descriptive count given above shows that in the course of this verbal interaction Lady Booby threatens the face of Mrs Slipslop seven times only while the latter threatens the face of the former fifteen times . This provides evidence that despite the superior social status of Lady Booby she emerges out of this power game as the inferior party , while her confident interlocutor succeeds in reinforcing her position and emerging in authority . Role relations are reversed and this reversal is realised by changes in the linguistic behaviour of the characters engaged in dialogue or verbal interactions . The impact of this role reversal will continue to influence the shape of relationship between Mrs Slipslop and Lady Booby all throughout the novel . Although the lady dismisses others of her servants like Joseph (despite her secret love for him) she cannot dispense with her waiting-gentlewoman in whom she confides and whom she regards with admiration and awe . In fact it can be said that the reversal of roles and the peculiar quality of social relationships aptly and satirically presented by Fielding through the linguistic behaviour of characters in face-to-face verbal interactions are the very essence of **Joseph Andrews** .

Total number of FTAs 15

* shows that two utterances express the same FTA , the second utterance expressing it in a more emphatic way .

** shows that one utterances expresses two FTAs , one directly , another indirectly . Thus while (15) 'don't shock my ears with your beastly language' is a command , as shown by the use of the verb in the imperative mood , it can also be interpreted , indirectly , as an insult . In both cases , the FTA implicated is of the 'bald , non-redressive' type.

*** shows that the FTA is expressed, not verbally , or by means of words ; but paralinguistically , i.e. by means of gesture '... departed in a passion and slapped the door after her' .

+ shows that the request is expressed by the author in the form of a narrative report of a speech act (NRSA) . It is a form which is more indirect than indirect speech . It occurs in 'sentences which merely report that a speech act (or number of speech acts) has occurred , but where the narrator does not have to commit himself entirely to giving the sense of what was said, let alone the form of words in which they were uttered' (Leech & Short 1981 : 323) . Thus (6) 'she wishes she knew her own mind ...' could have , as its direct speech counterpart : 'Please tell me your own mind'.

++ shows that the utterance involves two FTAs paratactically related : the first an indirect accusation of immodesty and the second , 'and I know what I know', an implied threat .

Total number of FTAs 7

B-FTAs directed by Mrs Slipslop against Lady Booby

(6)	Pos. face, (a)	disapproval
(8)	" " "	disapproval
(10)	" " "	ridicule
(13)	" " (b)	mention of taboo topics
(17)	" " (a)	ridicule
(19)	" " "	ridicule
(20)	" " (b)	irreverence
(23)	Pos. face, (a)	ridicule
(27)	" " "	ridicule
(28)	" " "	accusation
(33)	" " (b)	irreverence
(34)	" " (b)	irreverence (non -
(34)		verbal) ***
(6)	Neg. face —	request +
(28) ++	" " —	threat
(31)	" " —	threat

Acts which threaten or damage the **negative face** of the addressee include requests , commands and threats . Such acts constitute an impingement on the hearer as they encroach on his desire to be free from any imposition .

In the light of the above definitions we can establish a statistical count of the FTAs used by Lady Booby and Mrs Slipslop to show which of them is the more powerful interactant :

A-FTAs directed by Lady Booby against Mrs Slipslop

Number of utterance in extract	Description of FTA	
(11)	Pos. face, (a)	ridicule
(15)	" " "	insult
(21)	" " "	criticism
(22, 25) *	" " "	insult
(4,14)	Neg. face —	command
(15) **	" " —	command
(26)	" " —	threat

further intensified by Mrs Slipslop's threat (31) . This puts Lady Booby in a very weak position , and conversely consolidates the position of Mrs Slipslop . This reversal in the interactive relationship of the two characters is linguistically encoded in the vocative 'mistress' in (29) 'What do you know mistress ?' , which is the only title used in the latter part of the interaction and which , interestingly enough , is used by Lady Booby in addressing her servant .

The reversal of role relations can also be indicated by the number of face threatening acts (FTAs) each participant directs against the other in the verbal interaction . Such FTAs , when used by a speaker , denote the position of relative power he holds over the addressee . Thus if one of the participants in a dialogue uses more FTAs than the other , this will be an indication of the higher position he holds in that speech situation . Before we establish a count of the FTAs by Lady Booby and Mrs Slipslop , we would like to mention the nature or type of acts which threaten or damage 1-the **positive face** and 2-the **negative face** of the addressee .

Brown and Levinson (1978) give a list of acts (quoted by Simpson 1989 : 189) which can threaten or damage the **positive face** of the hearer . These acts fall into two categories : (a) acts indicating that the speaker has a negative **evaluation** of the addressee's positive face (include expressions of disapproval , criticism , contempt , or ridicule) : (b) acts indicating that the speaker does not care about the addressee's positive face (include irreverence , mention of taboo topics , including those that are inappropriate in the context , expressions of violent emotions) .

The dialogue reaches a climax when Lady Booby , in her final attempt to assert her authority , threatens to dismiss Miss Slipslop from her house : 'unless you mend your manners , this house is no place for you . 'The servant's retort , however , sets the lady off-balance as it involves two serious threats : that she knows something which can stigmatise her lady (28) and that she is under no obligation to keep it a secret (31) .

V. Reversal of roles

Role relations are usually linguistically realised by status-marking vocatives including names , titles and deferential honorifics , i.e. terms of address , like 'Sir', 'Mr', 'Mrs', 'Your Honour' ..., which reflect the relative social status of the participants in the interaction . In this extract , where both participants are competing for dominance , such status-designating vocatives are rarely used . The only occurrences are in (1) where Lady Booby calls her waiting-gentlewoman by her last name only , which is an indication of the lady's superiority on the status scale , and (20) where Mrs Slipslop uses the title of respect 'madam' . The last part of the interaction (20-34) , with the exception of the word 'mistress' in (29) is completely denuded of such vocatives . Here , there is a noticeable change of relations between the two participants . By the end of the dialogue , role relations are reversed . This becomes clear when Mrs Slipslop makes the serious revelation that she knows something of weight (something that might unfavourably affect the reputation and compromise the social status of her mistress) . The lady's apprehensions are increased by Mrs Slipslop's deliberate refusal to spell out what 'she knows' (28) and they are

"Lady" Booby is here referring to Miss Slipslop's misuse of words in (13) where she says 'morphrodites' when she means 'hermaphrodites'. The lady may be also referring to the sexual connotations of the word 'hermaphrodites', in which case (15) would be construed as a double insult to Mrs. Slipslop, meaning that she was both ignorant and immoral. Coupled with the abruptness of the order 'don't shock my ears!' (15) can be regarded as a strong FTA.

Lady Booby is now confident that she has asserted her dominance, resumed control of the situation and gained the territory she has lost. But Mrs Slipslop's heavily sarcastic response (16-17) comes as a fresh FTA and a new challenge to the lady's position.

The next part of the verbal interaction (18-34) consists of desperate attempts by Lady Booby to assert her authority and correspondingly serious challenges to this authority by Mrs Slipslop. The latter assumes full control of the situation, dominates the conversation and pulls the carpet from under her lady's feet. She resorts to various verbal strategies in order to achieve her end. She uses the tactic of repeating the last word in each of her lady's utterances (19, 23, 27), a practice which is highly provocative as it involves a large measure of disparagement, sarcasm, disbelief and disrespect. She explicitly and unequivocally pulls down the social distinctions between herself and her lady (20) 'servants have tongues as well as their mistresses'. Each of her utterances involves an FTA of the 'bald, non-redressive' type. In (28), for instance, she touches on a very sensitive point where she obliquely hints that her mistress lacks modesty: 'I never was thought to want manners **nor modesty neither**' (Fielding's emphasis).

positive consistent self-image or personality claimed by interactants , including a desire that this image should be appreciated and approved by others'. Thus a request or an order may be said to threaten the negative face of the addressee since it encroaches on his desire to be free from imposition while the use by a speaker of insults or terms of abuse can be regarded as a threat to the positive face of the addressee since it involves an unfavourable evaluation by the speaker of the addressee's public self-image . "Such acts , which pose a threat to either the positive or the negative face of the addressee are known as face threatening acts. (Simpson 1989 : 173) .

To go back to our extract from **Joseph Andrews** we find that strong command issued by Lady Booby (14) : 'Do as I bid you' is an FTA in the performance of which the lady shows no concern for the face of Mrs Slipslop . Such acts are always clear , unambiguous and concise . They are said to be done **baldly , without redress** . 'In fact , a bald non-redressive act is one which adheres faithfully to Grice's four conversational maxims . It is maximally efficient in so far as it is non-spurious (quality) , it does not say more or less than is required (quantity) , it is relevant (relation) and it avoids ambiguity and obscurity (manner) . Many non-redressive FTAs occur where the speaker holds high relative power and fears no threat of his own face from the addressee . (Simpson : 1989 : 173-4) . Lady Booby caps with another FTA (15) which combines a strong command with a direct insult : 'and don't shock my ears with your beastly language'. While (14) constitutes a threat to Mrs Slipslop's negative face , (15) is a threat to her positive face since it involves a strong attack against , and hence an unfavourable evaluation of , "her use of language".

verb in (8) 'cries Slipslop'. This can only be interpreted as an attempt by Mrs Slipslop to dominate the conversation and decide the issue in her favour. Lady Booby now notices that her authority is being strongly shaken , so she changes her strategy. She adopts a defensive attitude , as this is clear from her question (12) . Her interlocutor , however , dodges the question , thus breaking , once more , the maxim of **relation** . Her remark (13) again involves both opposition and criticism .

IV. Role Relations

At this point of the verbal interaction , **the principle of politeness** is abandoned altogether . Lady Booby notices that her power has gone and that she has lost territory to her servant . This necessitates a change in strategy . She must adopt offensive tactics . She resorts to strong commands (14) call face threatening acts (abbreviated as FTAs) .

According to Brown and Levinson , message construction - or 'ways of putting things' - is part of the expression of social relationships . A person can choose to be polite or impolite by saving or threatening the **face** of others . 'Face' is seen as a kind of 'self-image' which speakers in a society claim for themselves . It has two related aspects , called **positive** and **negative** face . Simpson (1989) , following Brown and Levinson (1978) says that negative face 'refers to any speaker's basic claim to territories , personal preserves and the right to non-distraction , in other words , the speaker's freedom of action and freedom from imposition . Positive face , on the other hand , refers to the

approbation maxim . According to Brown and Levinson (1978) , this is an instance of **positive politeness** which is specifically concerned with redressing the positive face of the hearer or uplifting his self-image . It includes , amongst other things , offers , compliments , claims to common ground and displays of interest and approval of each other's personality . Lady Booby is trying to win her waiting-gentlewoman to her side . Even when she makes a request , she softens it considerably ; this is linguistically encoded by the repetition of the second person pronoun 'you' after the imperative 'go' (so go you to the steward and bid him pay him his wages) .

Mrs. Slipslop's response is altogether unexpected . Instead of complying with her lady's request , she strongly criticises her by making an oblique reference to her indecision (6) . In so doing , she is breaking two of Grice's maxims ; the maxim of **relation** - "make your contribution relevant", and the maxim of **quantity** - "make your contribution as informative as possible-don't give too much or too little information ; avoid unnecessary prolixity". Mrs Slipslop's response (6), which also involves a violation of the **tact** maxim (Leech, 1982 : 25) brings about a noticeable change in the verbal transaction . Lady Booby , abandons her calm and modest attitude and adopts instead an attitude of peremptoriness ; 'she had taken a decision and resolved to keep it'(7).

Mrs Slipslop's retort is even more provocative : it not only implies a challenge to her mistress's decision (8) but even a harsh criticism of her character (9-10) . The rise in temper is emphatically expressed by the reporting

One thing to notice at the start is that although the topic of the conversation is supposed to be the dismissal of the 'wicked Joseph', this topic obviously constitutes a very negligible portion of the verbal interaction. Joseph's name is only mentioned once (by Lady Booby who initiates the conversation) and then is dropped altogether. The main body of the conversation is taken up by a power game in which each of the two participants is seeking to dominate, to control the dialogue, to gain territory, to save her face and emerge as the triumphant party. In this type of 'transaction management' (Burton 1982 : 87), it is Mrs Slipslop who obviously exerts the greater effort to control the dialogue in order to make up for her inferior social status. Thus she resorts to various types of acts as challenging, criticising, ridiculing and finally threatening in order to reinforce her position and re-adjust her social role. We finally get the impression that the role relations which normally pertain between mistress and servant are reversed.

Right from the beginning of the conversation, the role relations between the two characters are indicated. Lady Booby uses the last name only (1). Again, it is she who starts the conversational exchange. she also uses the speech act of commanding (4), which confirms the presupposition that she is socially superior to Mrs Slipslop. But although socially superior, Lady Booby obeys **the principle of politeness**, at least at the beginning of the conversation. For example (2) 'I find too much reason to believe all thou hast told me of this wicked Joseph', can be interpreted as a kind of compliment to Mrs Slipslop since it involves an approval of Mrs Slipslop's previous judgment concerning Joseph. This in itself is an indication that Lady Booby is observing the

tell that to every body ! says Slipslop , (30) , 'any more than I am obliged to keep it a secret.' (31)

'I desire you would provide yourself , 'answered the lady . (32)

'With all my heart , ' replied the waiting-gentlewoman ; (33) and so departed in a passion , and slapped the door after her . (34)

III . Analysis

The major part of this extract is made up of a conversation between Lady Booby and her waiting-gentlewoman , Mrs Slipslop . There are occasional remarks and comments thrown in by the author , Fielding , like sentence (5) which tells us something about the former attitude of Mrs . Slipslop towards her lady , i . e . one of deference and respect . (she had preserved hitherto a distance to her lady) and about a certain secret she has known about her lady which has changed her deferential attitude into one of sauciness and , in a sense , levelled down the social distinction between them . The author intrudes again in sentence (18) both to tell us about Lady Booby's suspicion (that her waiting woman knows the secret of her attempted seduction of Joseph) and to resume the conversation which has broken up at sentence (17) . This type of additional or extra information provided by auhorial remarks and comments is essential as it contributes straightforward clues to the understanding and analysis of texts or conversations . Apart from these two sentences , which introduce the author's remarks and comments , the rest of the extract is taken up by the conversation between the two characters .

morphrodites to wait upon you ... (13) 'Do as I bid you , 'says my lady (14) ' and don't shock my ears with your beastly language' (15)

'Marry-come-up.' cries Slipslop , (16) 'People's ears are sometimes the nicest part about them.' (17)

The lady , who began to admire the new style in which her waiting-gentlewoman delivered herself , and by the conclusion of her speech , suspected somewhat of the truth , called her back , and desired to know what she meant by that extraordinary degree of freedom in which she thought proper to indulge her tongue . (18)

'Freedom!' says Slipslop , (19) 'I don't know what you call freedom . madam: servants have tongues as well as their mistresses (20) 'Yes , and saucy ones too' answered the lady. (21) 'but I assure you I shall bear no such impertinence.'(22) 'Impertinence!' (23) 'I don't know that I am impertinent. 'says Slipslop.' (24)

'Yes indeed you are' , cries my lady (25) 'and unless you mend your manners. this house is no place for you.' (26)

'Manners !' cries Slipslop , (27) 'I never was thought to want manners **nor modesty neither** ; and for places , there are more places than one : and I know what I know.' (28)

'What do you know , mistress ?' answered the lady (29) 'I am not obliged to

Joseph. Joseph is pursued by Lady Booby but he has also to resist the amorous advances of the tigerish Mrs Slipslop . Before being summoned by her lady , Mrs Slipslop had carefully applied her ears to the keyhole and listened to her lady's endeavours to seduce Joseph . For ease of reference the text is given with sentence numbering :

“Slipslop’ , said the lady , (1) ‘I find too much reason to believe all thou hast told me of this wicked Joseph ; (2) I have determined to part with him instantly ; (3) so go you to the steward , and bid him pay him his wages’(4).

Slipslop , who had preserved hitherto a distance to her lady , rather out of necessity than inclination , and who thought the knowledge of this secret had thrown down all distinctions between them , answered her mistress very pertly, (5) ‘she wished she knew her own mind ; and that she was certain she would call her back again before she was half way down stair.’(6)

The lady replied , ‘ she had taken a resolution . and was resolved to keep it.’(7)

‘I am sorry for it. ‘cries Slipslop ; (8) and if I had known you would have punished the poor lad so severely , you would never have heard a particle of the matter . (9) Here is a fuss indeed . about nothing.’ (10) ‘Nothing’ returned my lady ; (11) ‘Do you think I will countenance lewdness in my house ?’ (12)

‘If you will turn away every footman’ said Slipslop , ‘that is a lover of the sport. you must soon open the coach-door yourself , or get a sett of

acts (for instance , by giving straightforward answers to questions) than a person of higher status who may wilfully or deliberately flout , or 'opt out' of , the cooperative principle , 'as , for example members of government do when they refuse to answer questions on the ground that the information required is classified' (Grice's example). Even more related to social status is the 'politeness principle' and the related maxims of 'tact' , 'generosity' , 'approbation' and 'modesty' suggested by Leech (1982 : 23-29) and expanded in Leech 1983 .

In the next section , which will be devoted to an analysis of an illustrative extract from Fielding's **Joseph Andrews** , I will try to show , from a discourse-oriented perspective , how the violation of social norms and the reversal of role relations are satirically encoded through the language medium , how the two characters participating in the verbal interaction , namely lady Booby and Mrs Slipslop , alterately compete for dominance and face-saving and how this satirical representation of role relations between the two characters contributes to the elucidation of the peculiar quality of social relationships in the whole novel.

II. Extract from Joseph Andrews

This extract is from Book I, chapter 9 , where Lady Booby , having emotionally , but injudiciously , exposed herself to the undesirable and humiliating situation of being refused by her footman , Joseph , summons her waiting gentlewoman Mrs Slipslop. to convey to her her decision of firing

Of particular importance to the sociolinguistic study of literary texts , notably drama and fiction , is the idea that the social relations existing between characters are encoded in the language system . A study of dialogue and conversation in plays and novels can help to establish and delineate the status and social role of each character in relation to the other characters engaged in the communicative event . For instance, terms of address and the pronoun system can be used to indicate nearness or remoteness in social relations (cf Brown and Gilman 1960: 253-60). Moreover, the use of title plus last name and Sir plus first name is characteristic of the way people of inferior status address their superiors . Similarly , last name alone 'is used by close equals or by people of superior status to well known inferiors' (Short, 1989 : 155) .

Social relations also play a significant role in determining the structural organisation of dialogues and conversations . According to social conventions , it is the person of superior social status who initiates the conversational exchanges (Coulthard , 1977 : 95-6) , who makes the first move , who leads and expresses his own will . It is also normal for a character with superior status to perform such 'speech acts' as commanding , questioning and threatening (Austin , 1962; Searle , 1969 , 1976) . Violation of such norms can lead to a reversal of values and social roles .

Respect for , or violation of , the '**cooperative principle**' and its regulative conventions or 'maxims' , notably the maxims of **quantity , quality , relation and manner** (Grice, 1975 : 41-58) is in some way linked to social status since a person of inferior status is normally more apt to cooperate in communicative

thought to characterise certain types of literary , mainly poetic , texts . Recent advances in sociolinguistics , pragmatics and discourse analysis have , however, strongly influenced stylistic studies and effected a change of orientation in the approach of stylisticians . Discourse analysts have been concerned with describing instances of language use in context since discourse analysis is the 'sociolinguistic analysis of natural language' (Stubbs , 1983) . Attention is more and more directed towards inter-sentential relations and towards sequences of conversational contributions across pairs of individual speaking turns . This tendency has been reflected in recent studies of literary texts which are regarded as occurrences of naturally occurring communication . The distinction between literary and non-literary language is increasingly getting blurred . Fowler (1981 : 21) argues that there is no special variety of language use which is exclusively literary .

"Some of the varieties used in the constitution of a specific 'literary' text may tend to occur regularly in some , but not all other 'literary' texts but they are not restricted to 'literary' texts (rhyme and alliteration are found in advertisements) and 'literary' texts also draw upon patterns which tend to occur in 'non-literary' texts (conversation , news report) . The stylistic overlapping and the absence of any necessary but sufficient linguistic criterion for the 'literary' text , is well known though often ignored . My suggestion is that stylistics and literary studies must take sociolinguistic variety theory and methodology seriously as a way of accounting for the specific linguistic properties of the texts concerned" .

I. Preliminary remarks

Literary studies have considerably benefited from recent work conducted in the field of linguistics and though a tendency still exists among some literary critics to ignore or underrate attempts made by modern linguists to extend the application of their theories and findings to the study and interpretation of literary texts , it remains a fact that the linguistic analysis of such features as syntax , lexis and discourse provides a satisfactory support and a reasonable basis for any systematic and objective discussion of works of literature. As early as 1960 , Roman Jakobson made a statement about the relationship between linguistics and literary studies which , by virtue of its attested relevance to literature and stylistics , has been quoted in most books on the subject and which . for the same reason , we do not find any justification for leaving out :

"If there are some critics who still doubt the competence of linguistics to embrace the field of poetics , I privately believe that the poetic incompetence of some bigoted linguists has been mistaken for an inadequacy of the linguistic science itself . All of us here , however , definitely realise that a linguist deaf to the poetic function of language and a literary scholar indifferent to linguistic problems and unversant with linguistic methods are equally flagrant anachronisms". (Jakobson. 1960 : 377) .

Significant strides have been made since the sixties in the area of linguistic studies of literary texts . Stylisticians in the sixties and seventies were mainly preoccupied with such issues as the definition of style and the isolation of syntactic , lexical and phonological deviations from the codes which were

INTERLOCUTOR'S ROLES

in

Joseph Andrews

Dr . Amin H. EL-RABBAT

Ph. D. London 1978